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Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal contests the decision of the examining division posted on 27 June 2008, refusing European patent application No. 01967509.9.

The appellants (applicants) filed a notice of appeal received on 5 September 2008 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day. No statement of grounds of appeal was filed.

II. In a communication dated 21 January 2009, sent by registered post with advice of delivery, the registrar of the board informed the appellants that no statement of grounds of appeal had been filed and that it was to be expected that the appeal would be rejected as inadmissible. The appellants were invited to file observations within two months.

III. No reply was filed to said communication.

Reasons for the Decision

1. Article 108 EPC requires that a statement setting out the grounds of appeal shall be filed within four months of notification of the decision. Pursuant to Rule 101(1) EPC the appeal shall be rejected as inadmissible if it does not comply with Article 108 EPC.

2. In the present case no document was filed by the appellants which could be regarded as a statement setting out the grounds of appeal. Consequently the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible.
Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.
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